

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the very thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 1, 2, 5-11, 13-15 and 17 remain in the application and claim 1 is independent. The Office Action dated February 22, 2010 has been received and carefully reviewed. Each issue raised in the Office Action is addressed below. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 1-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for antecedent basis issues identified in claim 1 and for an apparent contradiction in claim 4. The Examiner has provided some suggested identifiers such as “first” and “second” to distinguish the different electrode patterns. Responsive thereto, Applicants have adopted the suggested language and amended claim 1, and the claims dependent thereon to distinguish between the first and second electrode patterns. While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner’s rejection, but merely to advance prosecution of the instant application, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 4 has been cancelled, thus rendering this rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, moot. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims, as amended, particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Examiner Interview and Suggestion

Page 9 of the Office Action contains an encouragement to contact Examiner Perry prior to amending the application. Responsive thereto, Applicants’ representative Paul T. Sewell telephoned Examiner Perry on May 6, 2010 in an attempt to expedite the prosecution. During a brief discussion Examiner Perry suggested that in describing the portion of the first electrode patterns in which the second conductor is removed in a plurality of places, the claim should make clear that the plurality of places are “spaced apart” places. Applicants appreciate Examiner Perry’s suggestion and have incorporated it into the amendment. Applicants and Applicants’

representative wish to thank Examiner Perry for the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative during the brief but constructive discussion. The above constitutes Applicants statement of the substance of the interview.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2 and 4-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Masataka. Applicants submit the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness and respectfully traverse the rejection. A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the cited references must teach or suggest each and every element in the claims. See MPEP § 706.02(j) and MPEP §§ 2141-2144.

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance prosecution of the instant application, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 has been amended to recite a combination of elements in an embodiment of display apparatus including, *inter alia*, in each of the plurality of first electrode patterns, the second conductor is removed in a plurality of spaced apart places at a portion corresponding to the segment B1,

in each of the first electrode patterns, the higher resistance region includes a portion corresponding to the terminal region and is formed such that it continues to the terminal region in the connection region, provided that in an outermost electrode among the plurality of first electrode patterns, the segment A does not have the higher resistance region, and

the plurality of first electrode patterns have substantially the same resistivity value from the one end to the other end. Applicants respectfully submit that this combination of elements, including structure and the function that results from the structure, as set forth in independent claim 1, is not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including Masataka.

In the conductive layer (ITO film) 20 shown in Figure 1 of Masataka, a lamination film of Al/Cr is cut at one place and removed consecutively therefrom. This can be confirmed by also referring to Figures 11 and 12 of the reference. Applicants note that with such a structural

arrangement, the lamination film is likely to peel off due to stress caused by bending of the substrate for example.

On the other hand, in an embodiment of the instant invention, in each of the plurality of first electrode patterns, the second semiconductor is removed in a plurality of spaced apart places at a portion corresponding to the segment B1. Specifically, the second conductor is removed in a plurality of spaced apart places so that the second conductor is placed separately on the substrate, whereby stress caused by bending the substrate can be dispersed and a peel-off of the second conductor or the electrode pattern having the second conductor can be prevented. This results in improved adhesiveness between the electrode pattern having the second conductor and the substrate.

In other words, each of the plurality of first electrode patterns according to claim 1 has an advantage over the electrode pattern according to Masataka in which a lamination film of Al/Cr is cut at one place and removed therefrom, in that an occurrence of peel-off of the second conductor or the electrode pattern having the second conductor can be prevented by removing the semiconductor in a plurality of spaced apart places. When peel-off of the second conductor occurs, resistivity values may vary among the plurality of first electrode patterns, which is of course to be avoided. Accordingly, the structure of claim 1 effectively ensures that the plurality of first electrode patterns have substantially the same resistivity value from one end to the other end. Furthermore, when peel-off off the electrode pattern having the second conductor occurs, disconnection can occur at the peel-off portion. Accordingly, the structure according to claim 1 also effectively prevents the occurrence of disconnection.

Applicants respectfully submit that Masataka fails to properly address the features of claim 1 as now amended. Applicants make reference to Figures 1, 11 and 12 of Masataka by way of example. In each instance the Cr and Al conductive layer is clearly seen to be continuous in the Drawings, and in no instance does the reference show or suggest the second conductor layer "removed in a plurality of spaced apart places at a portion corresponding to the segment B1" as now recited.

Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of elements as set forth in independent claim 1 is not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including

Masataka, for the reasons explained above. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested. With regard to dependent claims 2, 5-11, 13-15 and 17, Applicants submit that dependent claims 2, 5-11, 13-15 and 17 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1 which is allowable for the reasons set forth above, and therefore claims 2, 5-11, 13-15 and 17 are allowable based at least on their dependence from claim 1. Reconsideration and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections raised in the Office Action having been properly traversed and addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Notice of same is earnestly solicited.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone Paul T. Sewell, Registration No. 61,784, at (703) 205-8000, in the Washington, D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: May 20, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By 

D. Richard Anderson

Registration No.: 40,439

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant